

1  
2 JS-6  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN A. JONES, } Case No. CV 12-10121 ABC  
Petitioner, }  
vs. } JUDGMENT  
KEVIN CHAPPELL, Warden, }  
California State Prison at San Quentin, }  
Respondent. }

---

Pursuant to the Order Denying Petition for Intervention by United States or  
States: Constitutional Question,

IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED that the Petition is denied and this action is  
dismissed with prejudice.

If Petitioner gives timely notice of an appeal from this Order, such notice  
shall be treated as an application for a certificate of appealability, 28 U.S.C. §  
2253(c), which will not issue because Petitioner has failed to make a substantial  
showing of the denial of a constitutional right. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S.  
322, 335-338 (2003) (noting that a certificate of appealability will only issue  
where a petitioner has made a “substantial showing of the denial of a  
constitutional right” and explaining that “a petitioner must sho[w] that reasonable

1 jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should  
2 have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were  
3 adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” (citations and internal  
4 quotations omitted)); *Williams v. Woodford*, 384 F.3d 567, 582-583 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004)  
5 (treating petitioner’s notice of appeal as an application for a certificate of  
6 appealability on the issues raised in his opening brief and explaining that as to  
7 each claim appealed petitioner must make “a substantial showing of the denial of  
8 a constitutional right.” (internal citations omitted)).

9  
10 Dated: December 17, 2012

*Audrey B. Collins*

— — —  
11 AUDREY B. COLLINS  
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28